REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 11 are currently amended. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments comply with requirements of form and thus may be admitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(1) and (b)(2). Alternatively, if these amendments are deemed to touch the merits, admission is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(3). In this connection, these amendments were not earlier presented because they are in response to the matters pointed out for the first time in the Final Office Action.

Lastly, admission is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(2) as presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-11, 14-15 and 17-18 were rejected as being anticipated by US 2005/0052465 (Moore). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 are amended to further clarity the invention. The amended claim language make clear that within the same network packet generated by the packet encoding device, some data sections correspond to "the local electrical signals received by different ones of the first interfaces destined for different remote computers." This claim language is supported by the specification (see, e.g., page 6, first paragraph, page 7, first and third full paragraph, and Fig. 3). As described in the background section of the present specification, in conventional systems, when several (local) manipulating devices simultaneously access multiple (remote) computers, the signal of each operation device has to be sent our in order, which is likely to cause signal delay. According to embodiments of the present invention, the same network packet can encode data sections from different local manipulating devices that manipulate different remote computers connected to the KVM switch. In other words, data sections within the same network packet are destined for different remote computers. (See, e.g., page 6, first paragraph, page 7, first and third full paragraph, and Fig. 3). As a result, when the device is encoding and transmitting signals from one local manipulating device intended for one remote computer, the signals from another local manipulating device intended for another remote computers do not have to wait for the next network packet to be transmitted. They can be transmitted in the same network packet, reducing signal delay.

The applicant submits that the claim language prior to the current amendment already requires this feature. For example, claim 1 recites: "wherein local electrical signals from

different first interfaces are for manipulating different local or remote computers ... at least some data sections of a same network packet corresponding to the local electrical signals received by different ones of the first interfaces." Thus, claim 1 required the data sections to correspond to signals received by different first interfaces, and the signals from different first interfaces are for manipulating different local or remote computers. Nevertheless, to highlight this feature, the applicant now amends claims 1 and 11 to read: "a packet encoding device, which generates at least one network packet having a plurality of data sections, at least some data sections of a same network packet corresponding to the local electrical signals received by different ones of the first interfaces destined for different remote computers" (claim 1) and "when the path destinations of the local electrical signals are the remote computers, at least one network packet having a plurality of data sections is generated, at least some data sections of a same network packet corresponding to the local electrical signals received from different ones of the plurality of local manipulating devices destined for different remote computers" (claim 11).

In this regard, the applicant submits that the amendment should be entered under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

The applicant respectfully submits that this feature is not described or suggested in any of the cited references. In the Response to Arguments (pages 2-3 of the Final Office Action), the Examiner makes two arguments, which are addressed below. First, the Examiner argued that "Moore teaches different interfaces connected to different peripherals (Moore; Figure 2 Items 118, 120, 128, and 130). These peripherals are for manipulating different local or remote computers (Moore; Figure 2 Items 102 and 104)." The applicant respectfully points out that only Items 118 and 120 are local devices connected to the local unit 116 (which the Examiner deems to correspond to the KVM switch of claim 1), and they are keyboard and mouse for manipulating the same computer. Items 128 and 130 are not local manipulating devices of the local unit 116. Rather, Items 128 and 130 are connected to the remote computer 104.

Second, the Examine argued that because Moore uses wireless communications protocol 802.11a to interconnect two KVM switches, it discloses the claimed packet encoding device. The applicant amends the packet encoding device element of claims 1 and 11 to expressly state that the data sections of the same network packet correspond to signals destined for different remote computers. As discussed earlier, this feature is implied in the pre-amendment claim language. The Moore reference describes using network packets to transmits signals between

KVM switches. Although the network packets contain data sections, as shown in the Computer Networking article by Furose and Ross, the cited references fail to teach or suggest that the different data sections in the same 802.11a network packet "correspond[] to the local electrical signals received by different ones of the first interfaces destined for different remote computers" as required by claims 1 and 11. Because the keyboard 118 and mouse 120 are for manipulating the same remote computer, even if a network packet contains data sections from both the keyboard 118 and the mouse 120, such data sections will be for the same remote computer.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the element "a packet encoding device, which generates at least one network packet having a plurality of data sections, at least some data sections of a same network packet corresponding to the local electrical signals received by different ones of the first interfaces destined for different remote computers" of claim 1 and the element "when the path destinations of the local electrical signals are the remote computers, at least one network packet having a plurality of data sections is generated, at least some data sections of a same network packet corresponding to the local electrical signals received from different ones of the plurality of local manipulating devices destined for different remote computers" of claim 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 and their dependent claims 3-5, 8-10, 14-15 and 17-18 are patentable over Moore.

Claims 2 and 12 were rejected as being obvious over Moore in view of US 6567896 (Shirley). Claims 6-7 and 16 were rejected as being obvious over Moore in view of the Examiner's Official Notice. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The deficiencies of Moore with respect to independent claims 1 and 11 are discussed above. The Shirley reference and the official notice do not cure this deficiency (see more detailed discussion in the previous Amendment dated Aug. 16, 2007). Accordingly, claims 2, 12, 6-7 and 16, which depend from claims 1 or 11, are patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 625-5076 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response or deficient in fees, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-3531.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 18, 2007

By: /Ying Chen/
Ying Chen
Registration No. 50,193
Attorney for Applicant(s)

255 S. Grand Ave., #215
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: 213-625-5076
Fax: 213-625-0691